

REMARKS:

This application has been carefully studied and amended in view of the Office Action dated February 4, 2003. Reconsideration of that action is requested in view of the following.

Applicant affirms the election of Group I and the specie of Figures 1-9 and 15 relating to an open sided cover and a broom.

Claims 25-30 have been added by this amendment. Claim 25 is a generic claim. Claims 26-30 are directed to the elected group and species. Claims 11 and 21-24 have been canceled without prejudice. Non-elected claims 10 and 14-18 remain in the application because those claims are dependent directly or indirectly on generic claim 25. If generic claim 25 is allowed then claims 10 and 14-18 should also be allowed. The pending claims are now claims 1-10, 12-20 and 25-30. This includes independent claims 1, 20, 25 and 27. Since there is now one independent claim in excess of 3 and one total claim in excess of the original 25 total claims, a supplemental fee of \$51.00 is attached.

The specification has been amended to comply with the objections raised by Examiner Cole. In addition, page 6 has been amended to insert the word "bifurcated" and thereby provide antecedent basis for that word in newly added claim 27.

The claims have been carefully reviewed and amended and the new claims have been drafted to take into account the rejection of

various claims under 35 USC § 112. The claims now should clearly comply with § 112.

---

It is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1-6 and 20 on the ground of obviousness-type double patenting be held in abeyance until claims are formally indicated as being allowed in the present application and in the copending application.

It is noted that claims 3-5 and 20 were not rejected over the prior art. Accordingly, it is assumed that these claims contain allowable subject matter. The features of claim 3 and its parent claim 2 have been incorporated into their parent claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 as now amended corresponds to claim 3 being written in independent form and amended to address the § 112 rejection. Claim 1 should therefore be allowed. Similarly, claim 20 has been written in independent form and should also be allowed.

It is respectfully submitted that newly presented claim 25 and its dependent claims 2-10, 12-19 and 26 are patentable over the prior art and particularly over the prior art which had been the basis of rejecting original claim 1. Parent claim 25 relates to the combination of a cleaning attachment or cover and a wipe. The preamble to parent claim 25 refers to a "cleaning assembly" in order to recite this combination. The various dependent claims have been amended or drafted to also refer to an assembly.

Parent claim 25 defines the assembly as including a flexible cover which has end sections interconnected by a central section,

fastening structure is on the end sections for selectively securing the end sections together. The fastening structure is located so that the end sections are selectively secured together at spaced locations with an open area therebetween. Upon detachably securing the end sections together an enclosure is formed having a top and a bottom. The fastening structure is located at the top of the enclosure and a central section is located at the bottom. The top of the enclosure is open with the end section spaced apart when the fastening section is disengaged, such as shown in phantom in Figure 2. This permits the cover to be mounted on the cleaning head of a cleaning implement by having the cleaning head pass through the open top of the enclosure which could be done, for example, by either wrapping the previously flat cover (as shown in Figure 6) around the cleaning head and then securing the end sections together, as shown in Figures 2-3, or could be done by inserting the cleaning head into a bag-type enclosure or pulling the bag-type enclosure up over the cleaning head, as shown in Figure 10. When the enclosure is mounted around the cleaning head the handle of the implement extends through the open space between the spaced locations of attachment of the two end sections to each other. Claim 25 also defines a wipe detachably mounted to reusable mounting structure on the cover so that the wipe is thereby located at the central section to convert the cleaning implement to a mop. Because the wipe is secured to the cover by reusable mounting

structure the wipe can be removed after use and replaced by a different wipe attached to the same reusable mounting structure.

---

Claim 25 permits the reusable mounting structure to be either at the central section of the enclosure or elsewhere on the enclosure as long as the wipe is at the central section.

Granville relates to a relatively complicated cover for dust mop heads. As shown in Figures 4-5 the top of the cover has its ends secured together only over a portion of the top, namely, to the point 39 which forms a seam 36 from front 37 to point 39 with the remainder being open from point 39 to rear 38. See, for example, Figures 4-5 and 8 and col. 4, lines 15-21. When the cover is to be mounted on the mop head the mop is inserted from the side inwardly into the cover with the handle of the mop extending through the open area between rear 38 and point 39 as shown in Figure 8. This differs from claim 25 in that, for example, claim 25 recites the fastening structure as being at two spaced locations of the end sections with an open area therebetween. Thus, the cleaning implement handle would be located and trapped between the two spaced fastened portions of the end sections which would provide a more secure mounting of the cover to the cleaning head. In contrast, the cover of Granville could be easily accidentally removed through the open side and open top portion of the cover if the mop head were moved relatively to the right of the illustration shown in Figure 8. Claim 25 in addition defines the enclosure as

having an open top when the fastening structure is disengaged to facilitate the mounting of the cleaning head through the open top.

---

This differs from Granville where the mounting of the cover to the mop head is through the side of the cover and wherein a significant portion of the cover top from end 37 to point 39 is closed with a further significant portion from point 39 to end 38 being open rather than the enclosure top being selectively either open or closed as defined in claim 25.

Claim 25 differs from Barry in numerous respects. For example, Barry does not show the combination of a cover and a detachable wipe. Instead, Barry shows a pad 13 which is apparently permanently secured to backing 43. Backing 43 is referred to in Barry as being "a sturdy backing member" (col. 2, lines 31-32). Backing 43 is permanently secured to the pad 13. If this combined structure of backing 43 and pad 13 is considered as the cover of claim 25, then the cover is not a flexible cover in the manner described in claim 25.

Chase likewise does not disclose or suggest the invention of claim 25. The Chase dry mop includes a casing 1 having a set of plies 5 permanently secured to the casing (col. 2, lines 25-27). Apparently in use an exposed plie could be detached which would then expose the previously underlying plie. There is, however, no suggestion of detachably mounting a wipe to a cover so that the same mounting structure which was used for detachably mounting the

wipe could be used to permit that wipe to be removed and replaced by a different wipe or even by the same wipe. In Chase there is no replacement of the plies by attachment to a reusable mounting structure. Instead, all of the plies are permanently secured to the casing.

It is respectfully submitted that parent claim 25 also differs from Dixon. Dixon shows a sanitary broom mop having a set of snaps completely down the side of the mop cover 3 so as to open the side of the mop cover and thereby permit the mop cover to be mounted to a broom through the side and not through an open top as defined in claim 25.

It is respectfully submitted that parent claim 25 is patentable over Geerin. Geerin is directed to a dusting and polishing device which includes strips 5 sewn or otherwise attached to the device. There is no suggestion of having a wipe detachably mounted by reusable mounting structure to a cover so that after use the wipe can be removed and the same mounting structure could be used to mount a different wipe or re-mount the same wipe as defined in claim 25.

It is respectfully submitted that claim 25 is also patentable over Green. Green is not directed to a cleaning implement. Instead, Green relates to a cover for a curling broom. A curling broom, however, is a device that is used in a sense as athletic equipment in the playing of a sport or game. See, for example, the

amplified description of a curling broom in Semenchuk which was cited by Examiner Cole. Since Green is not concerned with

10. converting a cleaning implement to a mop it is not surprising that Green lacks any disclosure of detachably mounting a wipe to the bottom of a cover or enclosure. This was apparently recognized by Examiner Cole in that Green was relied upon for the rejection of claims which did not define the wipe as part of the claimed structure.

Newly presented claim 27 and its dependent claims are directed to the elected species of Figures 1-9 wherein the cover is an open sided cover. Parent claim 27 refers to the structure of the cover both in its open condition, such as illustrated in Figure 6, and in its closed condition, such as illustrated in Figures 2-3. This includes such features as having one of the end sections of the cover bifurcated so as to form a pair of outwardly extending spaced flaps having an open area therebetween.

Many of the features of claim 27 were also defined in original claim 6. The Green patent was the sole reference relied upon for rejecting claim 6. It is respectfully submitted that parent claim 27 and its dependent claims patentably distinguish over Green. As noted above, Green is not concerned with a cover which would convert a cleaning implement into a mop. Rather, Green relates to a curling broom cover intended to protect the corn of the curling broom. Although not specifically illustrated, it is clear that the


Green cover in its open condition would comprise a generally flat sheet having a central single outwardly extending flap 16, not a pair of spaced flaps. Various fastening structures are located at various portions of the sheet so that when the Green sheet is folded upon itself the corners of the sheet and the single flap are secured together by means of fasteners 17a and 17b. Clearly, there is no disclosure of one of the ends of the sheet or cover being bifurcated to form two flaps spaced from each other with an open area therebetween. The purpose of the open area is to accommodate the handle of a cleaning implement. In Green the broom 13 or handle portion as shown in Figures 1-2 is actually at the end opposite or remote from the flap 16 in contrast to claim 27 wherein the opening is provided to accommodate the handle at a location opposite the location of the Green flap. Green also lacks the inclusion of reusable mounting structure which would permit the mounting or securement of a wipe at a location below the cleaning head at the bottom of the loop formed when the end sections are attached to each other. In rejecting claim 6 Examiner Cole had referred to elements 18, 19 and 20. These elements are the pocket 18 having a window 19 to receive an identification card 20. These elements are located at an intermediate portion of the cover when the cover is mounted on the curling broom. Accordingly, these elements do not correspond to reusable mounting structure which would secure a wipe to the bottom of the loop formed by the cover as defined in claim 27.



In view of the above remarks and amendments this application  
should be passed to issue.

---

Respectfully Submitted,

By:   
Harold Pezzner, Esquire  
Reg. No. 22,112  
Connolly Bove Lodge & Hutz, LLP  
1220 Market Street  
Wilmington, DE 19801  
(302) 658-9141

::ODMA\MHODMA\CB;257661;1